



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,887	11/20/2003	Michael W. Allen	11180013010202	9407

37211 7590 10/19/2006

BASCH & NICKERSON LLP
1777 PENFIELD ROAD
PENFIELD, NY 14526

EXAMINER

PATEL, RAJNIKANT B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2838

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

sf

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/717,887	Applicant(s) ALLEN ET AL.	
	Examiner Rajnikant B. Patel	Art Unit 2838	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 September 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 17-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 17-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/04</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 1,14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodriguez et al. (U.S. Patent # 4,622,627) in combination with Cama et al. (U.S. Patent # 6,211,457B1).

Rodriguez et al. disclose the claimed subject matters an electronic power supply (figure 1-3), including an encapsulated portion and circuit board (Abstract, line 15-20), a dielectric material (column 3, line 65-70 and column 4, line 1-5) and output connector at terminals (figure 3, item 66 and 66'). However Rodriguez et al. does not disclose the utilization of the technique for an integrated connector. Cama et al. teaches the utilization of the similar technique for an integrated connector (figure 1, item 18). It

would have been obvious one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Rodriguez et al.'s power supply by technique taught by Cama et al. for the purpose of securing firm connection with external devices.

3. Claim 2-6, 9-13 and 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodriguez et al. (U.S. Patent # 4,622,627) in combination with Cama et al. (U.S. Patent # 6,211,457B1) and further in combination with Wong (U.S. Patent # 6,456,511).

Rodriguez et al. in combination with Cama et al. disclose the claimed subject matters as explained in the claim 1, above, except the utilization of the technique for an inrush current limiting circuit, a rectifier, a MOSFET, a capacitor, a resistive charging and a resistive connection. Wong teaches the utilization of the similar technique for an inrush current limiting circuit(column 6, line 10-15),, a rectifier (figure 2, item 71), a MOSFET(figure 2, item 75), a capacitor (figure 2, item C4), a resistive charging (figure 2, item R4 and R5), zero threshold (column 10, line 45-50) and a resistive connection (figure 2, item 70). It would have been obvious one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Rodriguez et al. in combination with Wong's power supply topology by utilizing the technique taught by Wong for the purpose of providing a power supply to provide protection to user. In regards to claim 4, sensing a primary rectified voltage in the secondary low voltage manner and providing a representative signal to pin that is accessible to the user (figure 2, item 117 and pin 7),

an error amplifier (column 7, line 55-65), a comparison circuit and predetermined (or known) voltage reference (column 11, line 25-40).

4. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodriguez et al. (U.S. Patent # 4,622,627) in combination Nakamura et al. (U.S. Patent # 4,906,208).

Chen et al. disclose the claimed subject matters an encapsulated power converter (figure 1). Rodriguez et al. does not disclose the utilization of the technique for a detachable line cord connector with threaded mounts is earth grounded. Nakamura et al. teaches the utilization of the similar technique for a detachable line cord connector with threaded mounts and earth ground (column 3, line 35-40). It would have been obvious one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Chen et al.' power supply by utilizing the technique taught by Nakamura et al. for the purpose of providing encapsulated power supply.

5. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cross (U.S. Patent # 5,615,097) in combination with Rodriguez et al. (U.S. Patent # 4,622,627).

Cross discloses claimed subject matters an alternating current to direct current power converter (figure 1), including a current limiting means and MOSFET switch (figure 1, item 52), a bridge rectifier (figure 1, item 12), a capacitor charged via current limiting source (figure 1, item 54), a voltage level detection (figure 1, item 56), a resistive path

(figure 1, item 50). Cross does not disclose the utilization of the technique for an encapsulated current limiting circuit and power converter. Rodriguez et al. teaches the utilization of the similar technique for an encapsulated current limiting circuit and power converter. It would have been obvious one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cross's power converter encapsulated for the purpose of improved mechanical integrity, power density and thermal performance.

Conclusion


6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rajnikant B. Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-2082. The examiner can normally be reached on 6.30-5.00; m-f.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Karl Easthom can be reached on 571-272-1989. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Rajnikant B Patel
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2838
